

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Review

Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which concerns the connection between the forms of linguistics and the people who applying those forms (Yule, 1996). The language phenomena which are discussed in pragmatics mostly deal with the use of language by its user. As stated by Yule (1996), pragmatics is concerned with four areas. Firstly, pragmatics is the study of speaker's utterances and the effort of the hearer to interpret those utterances. Secondly, pragmatics is the study of the interpretation of speaker's utterance in particular context. In this case, both of the speaker and the hearer have to be aware of the context that follows the speaker's utterance. Thirdly, pragmatics is the study of how to recognize the implied meaning of the speaker's utterances. The last, pragmatics is the study which focuses on the expression of the closeness between the speaker and the hearer.

[illegible]

Another way for the speaker to show that he or she shares some common purposes with the hearer is by increasing the hearer's interest to the speaker's contribution. The speaker of this strategy may pull the hearer's attention to the conversation by making a good story or narrative. Therefore, the narrative should be clearly explained by the speaker.

Using in-group identity markers in speech

By applying in-group address forms in a conversation, the speaker can show solidarity and intimacy with the hearer. The hearer's positive face is saved as the speaker calls him or her as "*pal*", "*buddy*", "*sweetheart*" or even his or her familiar nickname. These identity markers strengthen the closeness between the speaker and the hearer.

Seeking agreement in safe topics

In expressing positive politeness, the speaker also can apply the strategy of seeking agreement in safe topics. It is a strategy that allows the speaker to find a possibility in which he or she can agree with the hearer's statement in safe topics,

) Avoiding disagreement

Avoiding disagreement is one way to save the hearer's positive face. The speaker of this strategy may hide his or her disagreement by doing a white lie. As stated by Cutting (2002:40), a white lie is "a lie with good intentions." Besides, the speaker also can hide his or her disagreement by pretending to agree through the use of hedges.

Presupposing, raising, asserting common ground

Another positive politeness strategy is presupposing, raising, asserting common ground. This can be done by sharing same interests, beliefs and opinions between the interlocutors. The speaker in this strategy makes a small talk that includes the hearer into the discussion. He or she usually uses pronoun “*we*” to include the hearer into the conversation

) **Joking to put the hearer at ease**

The speaker of positive politeness can show solidarity and familiarity to the hearer by making a joke which will make the hearer feel relieve.

Asserting or presupposing knowledge of and concerning for hearer's wants

In applying this strategy, the speaker shows his or her solidarity by emphasizing that he or she knows personal information about the hearer. The speaker also tries to fulfil what the hearer's wants to show that the speaker is cooperated with the hearer. By fulfilling the hearer's wants, the speaker can save the hearer's positive face.

) Offering & promising

In order to minimize the potential threat and to show that the hearer and the speaker are cooperated, the speaker can offer or promise something to the hearer. The speaker may state that the speaker certainly does something for the hearer. This strategy shows the speaker's good *intention* in satisfying the hearer's wants.

Being optimistic that the hearer wants what the speaker wants

In expressing positive politeness, the speaker can also apply the strategy of being optimistic that the hearer wants what the speaker wants. The speaker saves

The cooperative principles is a theory developed by Grice in 1975. According to Grice in Yule (1996), the cooperative principles is a basic assumption in conversation that each interlocutor attempts to speak properly to construct a successful conversation. Grice (1975) elaborates the cooperative principles into four sub-principles which is known as maxims. Those are maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner.

Maxim of Quantity

The first maxim of cooperative principle emphasizes the speakers to be informative. A contribution should be as informative as it is required for the conversation. It should be neither too little, nor too much. Some speakers observe maxim of quantity by saying “*to cut a long story short*”, “*as you probably know*”, and “*I won’t bore you with all the details*”.

Maxim of Quality

This maxim emphasizes the speakers to be truthful. They should not say something that they think or believe to be false, or make statement for which they have no proof. Some speakers try to observe this maxim by saying “*as far as I know*”, “*I may be mistaken*”, “*I am not sure if this is right*” and “*I guess.*”

Maxim of Relation

The maxim of relation emphasizes the speakers to be relevant. They should make their contributions relevant to the previous statement. Garfinkel in Cutting (2002) gives an example “*The baby cried. The mommy picked it up.*” It can be assumed that the mother of the baby is the “*mommy*” and she picked it up because the baby was crying.

Maxim of Manner

The last maxim of cooperative principles emphasizes the speakers to be clear. They should be brief and orderly, and prevent obscurity and ambiguity. Some speakers observe the maxim of manner by saying “*I’m not sure*”, “*I don’t know*” or “*just to clarify*”.

2.1.5 Violating Maxim

According to Cutting (2002), when a speaker violates a maxim, hearer she says something that makes the hearer not know the true meaning of the utterance. Therefore, the hearer only knows the surface meaning of the utterance. Cutting (2002) describes the maxim violation and provides some examples as follow.

Violation of Quantity Maxim

The first type of maxim violation of cooperative principle is violation of quantity maxim. When a speaker violates the maxim of quantity, he or she does not provide enough information to the hearer to understand what is being talked about.

Violation of Quality Maxim

The speaker who violates the maxim of quality may deliver the wrong information and not being sincere to the hearer. Thus, lying is a violation of quality maxim.

Violation of Relation Maxim

If a speaker violates the maxim of relation, he or she will say something that is not relevant with the previous statement.

Violation of Manner Maxim

The last type of maxim violation is violation of manner maxim. When a speaker Moreover, the speaker may also avoid being brief and orderly in delivering his or her message tells an ambiguous statement, he or she can be said to violate the maxim of manner.

2.1.6 Relationship between politeness strategy and cooperative principle

In pragmatics, people can study about cooperative principle and politeness strategy. However, according to Cutting (2002), the cooperative principle sometimes conflict with the politeness principle. If the speakers want to express positive politeness, they may violate cooperative maxims. The following is an example when a speaker expresses a positive politeness strategy and violates the cooperative maxims:

(2:48) A: How do I look?

B: Good (Thinks: “Awful”)

(Cutting, 2002)

It is clearly seen that B applies avoiding disagreement strategy of positive politeness. To save the hearer's positive face, B prefers to tell a white lie than insult A with the reality. B hides his or her true opinion that A does not look good. Thus, B violates the maxim of quality by not being sincere.

2.1.7 Medea by Euripides

Medea is an ancient Greek tragedy written by Euripides, based upon the myth Jason and Medea and first produced in 431 BCE. Medea is a young princess who falls in love with the Greek hero, Jason, and because of that love betrays her own father, helps Jason to steal the Golden Fleece and flees her homeland. They

This research studies the linguistics phenomenon under the pragmatics study. In this study, the researcher observes the positive politeness strategy employed by the characters in *Medea* and the maxim violating when they are using those strategies. The researcher examines the dialogues of all characters in the drama script that contain positive politeness strategies. The researcher uses the theory of politeness strategy proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) namely the positive politeness. Based on the theory, there are fifteen strategies of positive politeness.

[illegible]

Figure.1 : Analytical Construct

